

3 December 2011

EXPLANATORY NOTES TO THE EXAMINER

Dear Colleague

Thank you for your willingness to part-take in this quality assessment of our PhD students' research studies of the Faculty of Education Sciences, NWU (Potchefstroom Campus).

The assessment guidelines and instrument that accompanies these explanatory notes is not meant to be a mere checklist. It is offered as a guideline to assist you in assessing the thesis as accurately, comprehensively and fairly as possible in terms of five broad evaluation sections (topic/theme, perceived need, research design and methodology, relevance of findings and language and style), as well as in terms of level(s) of execution.

In each case, you are provided with a brief qualitative Although we expect to recognise your own, personal signature in your narrative, qualitative account of the candidate's work, you may, should you wish to do so, choose to quote particular words, phrases or even sentences from these guidelines in order to support – in each case – your own argument or contention.

account of the kind of issues that need to be taken into consideration when assessing the extent to which the student has succeeded in dealing with a particular category in her/his thesis.

Before awarding a grade for each of the five sections, and before awarding a final grade for the thesis as a whole, you are consequently requested to study the appropriate guidelines carefully.

When completing the narrative part of your assessment of the candidate's thesis, you are again invited please to study all relevant guidelines circumspectly.

Sincerely

Prof Cornelia Roux

(Research Director)

☎ +27 -(0)18 2994780

cornelia.roux@nwu.ac.za

GUIDELINES FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF PhD THESES

These assessment guidelines of the Faculty of Education Sciences is in line with the official assessment documents of the NWU and the General Academic rules (A8.5/2009)

SECTION A		D Fail	C2 Poor to Average	C1 Average	B2 Average to Good	B1 Good to Excellent	A Excellent
Explaining the theme of this research	<p>This section topicality seeks to cover the interrogation of themes such as the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • title & topicality • purpose and intentions • problem statement • scope • selecting and presenting a focus • clarity • framing of reader expectations <p>The list is not exhaustive. It serves merely as an example of the kind of themes that need to be considered in this section.</p>	<p>Title of thesis does not reflect research problem. Utterly inadequate attempt at stating the problem, purpose (importance) and focus of the research. Introduction offered introduces neither the topic, nor the conundrum¹ that led to the research. No evidence of intellectual clarity about the supposed intellectual conundrum. Delimitation of topic and broader topicality of research below minimum level of proficiency. No attempt at explaining what will follow, or in guiding the reader.</p> <p>Beyond repair. Recommendation: CATEGORY D</p>	<p>Not entirely clear why title is worded the way it is worded. Generally a meagre attempt at stating the problem, purpose (importance) and focus of the research. Abrupt or little introduction. Modest evidence of clarity about the supposed intellectual conundrum. Delimitation of topic and broader topicality of research mostly inadequately explained. No or little interest in explaining clearly what will follow, or in guiding the reader.</p> <p>Major revision may be required. Recommendation: CATEGORY C</p>	<p>The relationship between title and major research problem acceptably formulated. Generally an average attempt at stating the problem, purpose (importance) and focus of the research. Highly conventional, unsurprising introduction. Adequate evidence of clarity about the supposed intellectual conundrum. Delimitation of topic and broader topicality of research sufficiently explained. Discernable attempts at explaining as clearly as could be expected what will follow. Honest attempts to guide the reader.</p> <p>Major to limited revision may be required. Recommendation: CATEGORY C</p>	<p>The relationship between title and major research problem admirably formulated. Generally an above average attempt at stating the problem, purpose (importance) and focus of the research. Highly conventional, unsurprising introduction. Adequate evidence of clarity about the supposed intellectual conundrum. Delimitation of topic and broader topicality of research explained in clear, logical language. Discernable attempts at explaining as clearly as could be expected what will follow. The reader is suitably guided.</p> <p>Limited to minor revision may be required. Recommendation: CATEGORY B</p>	<p>The relationship between title and major research problem very well formulated. Generally a very good attempt at stating the problem, purpose (importance) and focus of the research. Introduction shows clear academic dexterity and scientific promise. It is clear, right from the start, that the candidate deeply understands the intellectual conundrum that has led to this research. Delimitation of topic and broader topicality of research explained in remarkably well written language. Author expertly explains in crisp, clear language what will follow. The reader is skilfully guided.</p> <p>No to minor revision may be required. Recommendation: CATEGORY B</p>	<p>The theoretical link between title and major research problem is brilliantly and giftedly formulated. A noteworthy way in which the problem, purpose (importance) and focus of the research has been stated. Introduction shows significant academic prowess and scientific potential. It is clear, right from the start, that the candidate intimately understands the intellectual conundrum that has led to this research. Delimitation of topic and broader topicality of research explained in outstandingly well composed, argumentative prose. Author capably and knowledgably explains in crisp, clear language what will follow. The reader is skilfully and effortlessly guided.</p> <p>No revision at all required. Accept as is. Recommendation: CATEGORY A</p>

¹ The use of this term is preferred, because it draws attention to the thought-provoking nature of a discernible, identifiable intellectual challenge. As such, the term *conundrum* denotes considerably more – in terms of academic significance and scientific rigour – than the (relatively colloquial) terms *problem* or *puzzle*.

SECTION B		D Fail	C2 Poor to Average	C1 Average	B2 Average to Good	B1 Good to Excellent	A Excellent
Explaining the need for this research	<p>This section topicality seeks to cover the interrogation of issues such as the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> causes of problem actuality, importance and relevance of problem and rationale behind research undertaken indicating lacunae² in the literature explaining why lacunae exist identifying critical questions <p>The list is not exhaustive. It serves merely as an example of the kind of issues that need to be considered in this section.</p>	<p>No conceptual linkage between title and problem statement indicated. No discussion of the causes and relevance of problem or why it is necessary to deal with it. Makes very poor reference to the possible causes of the problem. Generally a pitiable attempt at indicating lacunae in the literature. No attempt at providing reasons for the existence of such lacunae. Needs to be reconceptualised in its entirety.</p> <p>Cannot be repaired. Recommendation: CATEGORY D</p>	<p>Conceptual linkage between title and problem statement not clearly argued. Little discussion of the causes and relevance of problem or why it is necessary to deal with it. Makes little reference to the possible causes of the problem. Generally a poor attempt at indicating lacunae in the literature. Meagre attempt at providing reasons for the existence of such lacunae.</p> <p>Major revision may be required. Recommendation: CATEGORY C</p>	<p>Conceptual linkage between title and problem statement adequately argued. Middle-of-the-road discussion of the causes and relevance of problem or why it is necessary to deal with it. Makes sufficient reference to the possible causes of the problem. Generally an average attempt at indicating lacunae in the literature. Although s/he attempts to offer reasons for the existence of such lacunae, there still are omissions.</p> <p>Limited revision may be required. Recommendation: CATEGORY C</p>	<p>Conceptual linkage between title and problem statement neatly and efficiently argued. Above average discussion of the causes and relevance of problem or why it is necessary to deal with it. Makes better than average references to the possible causes of the problem. Generally a good attempt at indicating lacunae in the literature. Evidence that the candidate genuinely tried to provide reasons for the existence of such lacunae.</p> <p>Minor revision may, however, still be required. Recommendation: CATEGORY B</p>	<p>Conceptual linkage between title and problem statement comprehensively and very well argued. Thorough and well organised discussion of the causes and relevance of problem or why it is necessary to deal with it. Very good references to the possible causes of the problem. Generally an admirably composed attempt at indicating lacunae in the literature. It is clear that the candidate deeply understands the major reasons for the existence of such lacunae.</p> <p>No to minor revision may be required. Recommendation: CATEGORY B</p>	<p>Conceptual linkage between title and problem statement excellently argued. Detailed and very professional discussion of the causes and relevance of problem or why it is necessary to deal with it. Exceptional references to the possible causes of the problem. Generally a brilliantly composed attempt at indicating lacunae in the literature. It is clear that the candidate intimately comprehends the major reasons for the existence of such lacunae.</p> <p>No revision at all required. Accept as is. Recommendation: CATEGORY A</p>

² A gap or gaps in our understanding, or a place or places where information is lacking.

SECTION C	D Fail	C2 Poor to Average	C1 Average	B2 Average to Good	B1 Good to Excellent	A Excellent	
Explaining research design and methodology	<p>This section topicality seeks to cover the interrogation of issues such as the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • review of the body of scholarship • locating and presenting an epistemological paradigm • locating and presenting a conceptual and theoretical framework • presenting research design • presenting research methodology • presenting a data collection plan • planning for and presentation of a data analysis strategy • dealing with reliability and validity concerns <p>The list is not exhaustive. It serves merely as an example of the kind of issues that need to be considered in this section.</p>	<p>Research design hopelessly inadequate and insufficient. No effort to explicate the reasons for working within the selected methodology. Study shows no evidence of trying to harmonise research design, intellectual conundrum and purpose. Research problem disappointingly formulated and very badly argued. Overall a very superficial and completely deficient attempt at reviewing the available body of scholarship. Argumentation never infused with proper theoretical evidence. No evidence of critical scholarship in handling secondary source material and quotations. Quality of intellectual work reflects a meagre attempt at collating wrong and outdated literature content and scantily presented empirical data. Research is of no intellectual value. Study doesn't contribute to social and intellectual capital. Very poor or even no reasoning regarding reliability (or trustworthiness) and validity issues.</p> <p>Thesis, in its present form, is demonstrably beyond repair. Recommendation: CATEGORY D</p>	<p>Research design mostly inadequately and insufficiently explicating the reasons for working within selected methodology. Study shows strained efforts at harmonising research design, intellectual conundrum and purpose. Research problem poorly formulated and inadequately argued. Overall a rather inadequate, limited review of the available body of scholarship. Argumentation hardly ever infused with proper theoretical evidence. Little evidence of critical scholarship in handling secondary source material and quotations. Quality of intellectual work doesn't seem to go beyond collation of literature content and empirical data. Research is of little intellectual value. Study hardly contributes to social and intellectual capital. Half-hearted reasoning regarding reliability (or trustworthiness) and validity issues.</p> <p>Major revision may be required. Recommendation: CATEGORY C</p>	<p>Use of predictable, semantically bland language to explicate how the chosen research design relates to the reasons that are offered for working within selected methodology. Efforts to harmonise research design, intellectual conundrum and purpose captured in stale, scientifically conventional language. Research problem just about adequately formulated, yet argued with considerable difficulty and in murky language. The candidate is able to justify — on the minimum level of proficiency — why s/he had made certain choices of theory, method, sampling, literature scooping etc, and not others. Research is of average intellectual value. Reasoning regarding reliability (or trustworthiness) and validity issues predictable. No attempt at methodological innovation. Design and methodology fairly predictable.</p> <p>Limited revision may be required. Recommendation: CATEGORY C</p>	<p>Research design more than adequately explicating the reasons for working within selected methodology. Study shows genuine efforts at harmonising research design, intellectual conundrum and purpose. Research problem adequately formulated and argued. Overall an average to above average review of the available body of scholarship. Argumentation sufficiently infused with proper theoretical evidence. Satisfactory evidence of critical scholarship in handling secondary source material and quotations. The candidate is able to justify — on an above average level of proficiency — why s/he had made certain choices of theory, method, sampling, literature scooping etc, and not others. Some evidence of methodological originality.</p> <p>Minor revision may, nevertheless, be required. Recommendation: CATEGORY B</p>	<p>Research design expertly explicating the reasons for working within selected methodology. Study shows evidence of advanced, innovative efforts at harmonising research design, intellectual conundrum and purpose. Research problem well developed and expertly argued. Overall a highly commendable review of the available body of scholarship. Argumentation smartly and imaginatively infused with proper theoretical evidence. Convincing evidence of critical scholarship in handling secondary source material and quotations. The candidate is clearly able to justify — on an admirable and respectable level of proficiency — why s/he had made certain choices of theory, method, sampling, literature scooping etc, and not others. Study shows evidence of methodological innovation to the study.</p> <p>No to minor revision may be required. Recommendation: CATEGORY B</p>	<p>Research design giftedly explicating the reasons for working within selected methodology. Study shows undeniable evidence of advanced, pioneering efforts at harmonising research design, intellectual conundrum and purpose. Research problem well developed and expertly argued. Overall an outstanding, excellent review of the available body of scholarship. Argumentation most skilfully and persuasively infused with proper theoretical evidence. Compelling evidence of critical scholarship in handling secondary source material and quotations. The candidate is able to justify — with exceptional intellectual logic and nuance — why s/he had made certain choices of theory, method, sampling, literature scooping etc, and not others. Study shows evidence of methodological ground-breaking work.</p> <p>No revision at all required. Accept as is. Recommendation: CATEGORY A</p>

SECTION D		D Fail	C2 Poor to Average	C1 Average	B2 Average to Good	B1 Good to Excellent	A Excellent
Explaining the academic and scientific relevance of the research findings	<p>This section topicality seeks to cover the interrogation of issues such as the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • presentation of results • discussion of findings • relevance of findings <p>The list is not exhaustive. It serves merely as an example of the kind of issues that need to be considered in this section.</p>	<p>There is clearly no connection between the problem/thesis introduced in the first chapter and what is offered in the data chapters. From the presented narrative in the thesis itself, it is furthermore clear that the candidate has no sense at all of what his/her thesis is actually about. The candidate also demonstrates no noticeable understanding of the data, its meaning(s) and representations. S/he also fails to present any evidence to convince the reader that s/he understands the implications of the theoretical choices that s/he has made. The data is never elevated beyond the specific case or instance or country that s/he had studied. S/he fails completely to interpret its meanings in the broader international context of scholarship on the subject. No detectable evidence of any contribution to the body of scholarship.</p> <p>This effort is beyond repair. Recommendation: CATEGORY D</p>	<p>Little connection between the problem/thesis introduced in the first chapter and what is offered in the data chapters. From the presented narrative in the thesis itself, it is clear that the candidate has little sense of what his/her thesis is actually about. The candidate demonstrates a poor to average understanding of the data, its meaning(s) and representations. S/he fails to present satisfactory evidence to convince the reader that s/he understands the implications of the theoretical choices that s/he has made. Amateurish attempt at elevating the data beyond the specific case or instance or country that s/he had studied. Relevance of the broader international context of scholarship on the subject not adequately explained. Contributes to the body of scholarship on the minimum level of proficiency.</p> <p>Major revision may be required. Recommendation: CATEGORY C</p>	<p>Adequate connection between the problem/thesis introduced in the first chapter and what is offered in the data chapters. From the presented narrative in the thesis itself, it is clear that the candidate has a satisfactory sense of what his/her thesis is actually about. The candidate demonstrates a par understanding of the data, its meaning(s) and representations. S/he presents sufficient evidence to convince the reader that s/he understands the implications of the theoretical choices that s/he has made. Amateurish attempt at elevating the data beyond the specific case or instance or country that s/he had studied. Relevance of the broader international context of scholarship on the subject adequately explained. Adequate contribution to the body of scholarship.</p> <p>Limited revision may be required. Recommendation: CATEGORY C</p>	<p>Average to better than average connection between the problem/thesis introduced in the first chapter and what is offered in the data chapters. From the presented narrative in the thesis itself, it is clear that the candidate has an average to good understanding of what his/her thesis is actually about. The candidate demonstrates a more than satisfactory understanding of the data, its meaning(s) and representation. S/he presents enough probable evidence to convince the reader that s/he understands the implications of the theoretical choices that s/he has made. An average to good attempt at elevating the data beyond the specific case or instance or country that s/he had studied. Relevance of the broader international context of scholarship on the subject more than adequately explained. Noteworthy contribution to the body of scholarship.</p> <p>Minor revision may be required. Recommendation: CATEGORY B</p>	<p>In this report of the research that was undertaken, there is ample evidence of originality, depth of understanding and critical reasoning. The candidate demonstrates an advanced ability to interpret his/her date in the light of the theoretical or conceptual framework described in earlier chapters. There is strong evidence of a well developed argumentative thread. S/he demonstrates the skill of being able to reason theoretically at an advanced level. In the discussion, the narrative unmistakably takes the data beyond the specific case or instance or country that s/he has studied, and interprets its meanings in the broader international context of scholarship on the subject. This is the work of a talented, novice scholar. Clear evidence in most places of advanced scholarship and careful reporting. Significant contribution to the body of scholarship.</p> <p>No to minor revision may be required. Recommendation: CATEGORY B</p>	<p>The candidate describes (logically and coherently) the supporting evidence to back each claim using the full range of data from the various sources (interviews, questionnaires, observations, statistics, profiles, diaries etc). For each claim, s/he provides a substantial and sophisticated description of the evidence. From the presented narrative in the thesis itself, it is clear that the candidate has a remarkably crisp, unambiguous and advanced scholarly sense of what his/her thesis is actually about. The candidate demonstrates a superior understanding of the data, their meaning(s) and representations. S/he demonstrates a lucid and scientifically superior understanding of the implications of the theoretical choices that s/he has made. Ample evidence overall of advanced scholarship and meticulous reporting. Distinctive and substantial contribution to the body of scholarship.</p> <p>No revision at all required. Accept as is. Recommendation: CATEGORY A</p>

LANGUAGE AND STYLE ³	D Poor to Average	C Average	B2 Average to Good	B1 Good to Excellent	A Excellent
Bibliography	Bibliography wholly incomplete and inadequate. Clear evidence of not understanding how to compile a bibliography. No evidence of understanding international bibliographical protocol – even at the minimum level of proficiency. Sources either too few or inaccurately captured. Needs major revision. Recommendation: CATEGORY D	Bibliography contains only a relatively high number of oversights, omissions and other errors. Some evidence of a mostly unsuccessful attempt at conventionality. In need of limited revision. Recommendation: CATEGORY C	Bibliography contains only a small number of oversights, omissions and other errors. Minor revision may be required in some cases. Recommendation: CATEGORY B	Entirely consistent and conforming in all respects to all relevant conventions. Is editorially error-free, with enough variety of literature types referenced. No to minor revision may be required. Recommendation: CATEGORY B	Excellent piece of work in all respects. No revision at all required. Accept as is. Recommendation: CATEGORY A
Academic style of writing and referencing	This effort is demonstrably borderline in most respects. Candidate clearly not able to write argumentatively in an academic register. Text riddled with errors of style and formulation. There are clear problems with the organisation of the text. No or little acknowledgement of authorities, weak structure, interrupted flow of argument. At the very most, an adequate product, but Major revision is essential. Recommendation: CATEGORY D	Adequate organisation of the text. Argument patchy in its logic and structure; some acknowledgement of authority, but inadequate. Limited revision is required. Recommendation: CATEGORY C	In places, the thesis shows evidence of having been written in a logical and sequential narrative throughout. The text is well organised. The candidate has clearly mastered the basics of academic writing and reporting. Minor revision may be necessary. Recommendation: CATEGORY B	On the whole, the thesis has been written in a logical and sequential narrative throughout, with a strong argumentative thread and conclusive knowledge claims. Every quoted authority appropriately acknowledged, well structured argument, logical flow. No to minor revision may be required. Recommendation: CATEGORY B	Lucid, precise language. The entire thesis has been written in a logical and sequential narrative throughout. Text meticulously edited. Author has mastered the principle of parsimony. Maintaining scholarly, argumentative style throughout. Figures, tables, photographs and diagrams, etc. logically and coherently integrated into verbal text. No need even to consider revision of any kind. Recommendation: CATEGORY A
Technical editing, grammar and spelling	Text riddled with language, grammar and spelling errors. The number of grammatical and spelling errors seriously interferes with the intended meaning of the text. It is immediately clear that the rendered text had never been edited by an expert language editor. Level of technical editing of such poor standard that it renders the text almost incomprehensible in places. Major revision almost certainly required. Recommendation: CATEGORY D	Contains some typical errors that could easily have been eliminated. Limited technical revision and expert language editing is, however, still required. Recommendation: CATEGORY C	Rendered text may conform to minimum technical standards, but it is still in need of appropriate and expert language editing. Minor revision may be necessary. Recommendation: CATEGORY B	Editorially, primarily error-free and fluent. Text rendered meets all available minimum standards of academic and scientific editing. No need for revision. Grammar and spelling in rendered text acceptable as is. No to minor revision may be required. Recommendation: CATEGORY B	Editorially, completely error-free and effortlessly fluent. Text rendered exceeds all available minimum standards of academic and scientific editing. Grammar and spelling of such a high standard that it serves as an example of excellence to others. No revision at all required. Accept as is. Recommendation: CATEGORY A

³ Please note that a thesis may not be failed **solely** on the basis of poor language and/or technical editing. Even in the worst case scenario (i.e. as far as language and technical editing is concerned), the thesis should be referred back for major, extensive corrections, alterations and improvements, including reworking and specialist re-editing.

1. Please grade each of the five sub-sections in the left-most column separately, using the above and below-mentioned matrices. **PhD-1**
2. When finished with (1) above, please recommend an overall evaluation category, again using the matrix provided to count the amount of the categories in order to complete **PhD 4** form.
3. Complete the administration form **PhD-2**
4. Next, please complete the narrative part of this assessment on form **PhD-3**
5. When finished with (3) and (4) above, please complete form **PhD-4**
6. **Send PhD 2; PhD 3 and PhD 4 forms to the NWU Examination Office.**

PhD-1

ASSESSMENT FORM FOR PhD THESIS

CATEGORIES SECTIONS	D Rejected. Candidate does not pass.	C Referred back to the student to be extensively revised and/or augmented and then re- submitted for evaluation.	B Corrections and adjustments of a technical, editorial, scientific and/or content nature required.	A Accepted as is. No changes required.
SECTION A Explaining the theme of this research				
SECTION B Explaining the need for this research				
SECTION C Explaining research design and methodology				
SECTION D Explaining the academic and scientific relevance of the research findings				
LANGUAGE AND STYLE: Bibliography, academic style of writing, referencing, technical aspects, editing				
COUNTING OF CATEGORIES IN NUMBERS TO HELP WITH THE INTERPRETATION OF THE FINAL NWU CATEGORY				

PhD EXAMINATION MARKS AND CATEGORIES

- **IMPORTANT TO NOTE**

The category chosen and the narrative will be made available to the promotro and the student in order to prepare for the oral defence (viva) of the PhD thesis.

1. **INTERPRET THE SYMBOLS OF THE GUIDELINES TO MATCH THE CATEGORIES IN THE TABLE BELOW**
2. **COMPLETE THE PhD 2 AND PhD 3 AND PhD4 SECTIONS THE OFFICIAL NWU EXAMINATION FORM**
3. **SEND PhD 2 (Administration) AND PhD3 (Narrative) AND PhD 4 (Categories) TO THE nwu (Potchefstroom Campus) EXAMINATION OFFICE**

GUIDELINES OF ASSESSMENT	D	C1 & C2	B1 & B2	A
WORDING OF NWU CATEGORIES	That the thesis is not accepted , in which case the student fails.	That the thesis be referred back to the student for review and/or amplification and resubmission for re-examination , in which case the supervisor, in consultation with the research director, and with notice to the school director where applicable, must ensure that a memorandum with regard to the nature and extent of the review or amplification be supplied to the student within two weeks after the outcome has been made known;	That the thesis be accepted on condition that adjustments of limited extent be effected , in which case the supervisor, in consultation with the research director, and with notice to the school director where applicable, must ensure that a memorandum dealing with the adjustments be supplied to the student within two weeks after the outcome has been made known;	That the thesis be accepted unconditionally
NWU EXAMINATION CATEGORY FOR THE THESIS	D	C	B	A

PhD-2



NORTH-WEST UNIVERSITY
YUNIBESITHI YA BOKONE-BOPHIRIMA
NOORDWES-UNIVERSITEIT
POTCHEFSTROOM CAMPUS

Fakulteit Opvoedingswetenskappe
Faculty of Education Sciences
Verwysingsnr: / Reference nr: 9.4.4.2

ADMINISTRATION FORM
EXAMINER'S REPORT: THESIS
ADMINISTRATIEWE VORM

EKSAMINATORSVERSLAG: VERHANDELING

PLEASE SEND **PhD 2;3;4** PAGES ELECTRONICALLY BACK

STUUR ASB **PhD 2;3;4** BLADYSE ELEKTRONIES TERUG

Date/Datum.....

1.	<i>Student / Student:</i>
2.	Title of Thesis / Titel van tesis:
3.	<i>Promoter / Promotor:</i>
4.	Co-promoter / Mede-promotor;
5.	<i>Degree / Graad:</i>
6.	<i>Examiner / Eksaminator:</i>

PhD 3

NARRATIVE REPORT

Finally, after having attended to the aforementioned assessment and evaluation matrix, we request that you complete the narrative part of your assessment report. In this particular regard, we trust that you may find the following eight rubrics to be of assistance:

1. Clarity of focus

.....

.....

2. Review of the body of scholarship

.....

.....

3. Theory and concepts

.....

.....

4. Research design, methodology and strategies

.....

.....

5. Innovation and creativity

.....

.....

6. New knowledge, insights and contribution(s) to the body of scholarship

.....

.....

7. Technical quality

.....

.....

8. Publishability of thesis or part of the study

.....

.....

Signature

EXAMINER

DATE

RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE EXAMINER / AANBEVELINGS DEUR DIE EKSAMINATOR

NWU (2009) A-rules accepted / NWU (2009) A-reëls aanvaar

X

a)	<p><i>That the thesis be accepted unconditionally;</i> Dat die tesis onvoorwaardelik aanvaar word</p>	
b)	<p><i>That the thesis be accepted on condition that adjustments of limited extent be effected, in which case the supervisor, in consultation with the research director, and with notice to the school director where applicable, must ensure that a memorandum dealing with the adjustments be supplied to the student within two weeks after the outcome has been made known;</i></p> <p>Dat die tesis aanvaar word op voorwaarde dat regstellings van beperkte omvang aangebring word, in welke geval die studieleier in oorleg met die navorsingsdirekteur, en met kennisgewing aan die skooldirekteur, waar van toepassing, toesien dat 'n memorandum ten opsigte van die regstellings binne twee weke na die uitslag bekend is aan die student voorsien word;</p>	
c)	<p><i>That the thesis be referred back to the student for review and/or amplification and resubmission for re-examination, in which case the supervisor, in consultation with the research director, and with notice to the school director where applicable, must ensure that a memorandum with regard to the nature and extent of the review or amplification be supplied to the student within two weeks after the outcome has been made known;</i></p> <p>Dat die tesis na die student terugverwys word vir hersiening en/of uitbreiding en herindiening vir hereksaminering, in welke geval die studieleier in oorleg met die navorsingsdirekteur, en met kennisgewing aan die skooldirekteur, waar van toepassing, toesien dat 'n memorandum ten opsigte van die aard en omvang van die hersiening of uitbreiding binne twee weke na die uitslag bekend is aan die student voorsien word;</p>	
d)	<p><i>That the thesis is not accepted, in which case the student fails.</i> Dat die tesis aanvaar word nie, in welke geval die student druipe.</p>	

EXAMINOR / EKSAMINATOR

Signature / Handtekening:

<p>Me Erna Conradie Senior Administratiewe Assistent</p> <p>MEd & PhD Program Navorsingsfokusarea: Onderrigleer Organisasies</p> <p>Fakulteit Opvoedingswetenskappe (Potchefstroom kampus)</p> <p>NOORDWES UNIVERSITEIT POTCHEFSTROOM 2520 Suid-Afrika Tel +27-18-299 4781 Faks +27-18-293 5245</p>	<p>THANK YOU FOR YOUR CO-OPERATION</p> <p>TOGETHER WITH YOUR REPORT, PLEASE RETURN</p> <p>PhD 2;3;4</p> <p>TO:</p> <p>MS/ME MANDIE JANSEN VAN VUUREN</p> <p>mandie.jansenvanvuuren@nwu.ac.za</p> <p>DANKIE VIR U SAMEWERKING</p> <p>STUUR ASB. SAAM MET U VERSLAG TERUG</p> <p>PhD 2;3;4</p>	<p>Ms Erna Conradie Senior Administrative Assistant</p> <p>MEd & PhD Programmes Research Focus Area: Teaching-Learning Organisations</p> <p>Faculty of Education Sciences (Potchefstroom Campus)</p> <p>NORTH-WEST UNIVERSITY POTCHEFSTROOM 2520 South Africa Tel +27-18-299 4781 Fax +27-18-293 5245</p>
<p><i>Please indicate whether you would like a bound copy of this thesis:</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Dui asb aan of u 'n gebinde kopie van hierdie tesis verlang:</p>	<p>Ja</p>	<p>Nee</p>